

**Remarks**

In response to the Office Action of June 28, 2005, the applicant asks the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 5 in view of the arguments presented herein:

**Allowed Claims**

The Applicant would like to acknowledge, with appreciation, the allowance of claims 1-4.

**Rejection of Claims**

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C § 102 (b) as being anticipated by the publication “Extending the IP Internet Through Address Reuse” (“Tsuchiya”). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

It is submitted that Tsuchiya does not describe or suggest a name and address server according to claim 5. The server of claim 5 has two addressing zones between which an interface caters for address translation and is situated in the first addressing zone. This server includes a data storage for storing associations between machine names and addresses of the first zone and a data processing module. The data processing module is designed to respond to the receipt from a first address of the first zone, of a request for an address related to the name of a destination machine belonging to the second addressing zone through the transmission to a second address of the first zone of a first packet containing at least the name of destination machine. The processing module is also designed to send back to the first address a response, after receipt from the second zone of a second packet containing a third address of the first zone associated in a dynamic manner with a second address of the second zone, providing the third address of the first zone.

As the Examiner notes, Tsuchiya “teaches about a name and an address server in a digital telecommunication network having first and second addressing zones between which an interface caters for address translations.” (Office Action, ¶ 1).

Furthermore, the Examiner is of the opinion that, in Tsuchiya, the server situated in the first addressing zone has:

- a data storage module for storing associations between machine names and addresses of the first zone; and

a data processing module designed to respond to the receipt, originating from a first address of the first zone, of a request for provision of an address in relation with the name of a destination machine belonging to the second addressing zone.

(Office Action, ¶ 1).

The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Considering that (stub A + DNS) is the first zone and (stub B + DNS) is the second zone, Tsuchiya does not disclose an association between machine names and address of the first zone. The passage cited by the Examiner (page 17, lines 21-24) does not describe the association between a machine name and an address of the first zone but, in contrast, describes an association between a machine name and an address of the second zone (referred to as “al.nxb.com” and “42.81.13.22”).

If (stub A + DNS) is the second zone and (stub B + DNS) is the first zone, the server described in Tsuchiya would lack the data processing module. In Tsuchiya, the request is transmitted from stub A in step 1 and thus nothing is provided to respond to the receipt originating from the first address of the first zone of a request for provision of an address in relation to the name of the destination machine belonging to the second addressing zone.

Moreover, whether stub A is the first zone or stub B is the first zone, Tsuchiya never describes the use of a third address of one zone associated in a dynamic manner with a second address of the another zone.

Specifically, Tsuchiya only describes the use of two addresses in each zone. In stub A, these two addresses are to 42.33.96.5 and “128.76.29.7” and in stub B, these two addresses are 42.81.13.22 and “128.76.28.4”.

Accordingly, Tsuchiya does not describe or suggest that any dynamic association be made between a second address of the second zone and a third address of the first zone.

Therefore, Tsuchiya does not anticipate claim 5.

In re Application of: Francois-Arnaud Remael  
Application No. 09/868,731  
Response to Office Action of June 28, 2005

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn and that the present application be permitted to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard A. Wulf, Reg. No. 42,238  
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS LLP  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698  
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)  
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)  
Customer No.: 08968

Date: October 19, 2005

In re Application of: Francois-Arnaud Remael  
Application No. 09/868,731  
Response to Office Action of June 28, 2005



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF JUNE 28, 2005 (along with any documents referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: October 20, 2005 I. Mikitiuk  
Irina L. Mikitiuk

CH01/12446664.1